	CABBYOU1	Sentencing	
1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COUSOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW Y	YORK	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	Λ	
4	V.		12 Cr. 36 (CM)
5	MENACHEM YOULUS,		
6	Defendant.		
7		x	
8			New York, N.Y. October 11, 2012
9			4:16 p.m.
10	Before:		
11	HON. COLLEEN MCMAHON,		
12			District Judge
13			
14	APPEARANCES		
15 16	PREET BHARARA United States Attorne Southern District of		
17	NICOLE FRIEDLANDER JANIS ECHENBERG		
18	Assistant United Stat	_	
19	BRAFMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.C. Attorneys for Defenda BENJAMIN BRAFMAN		
20	MARK M. BAKER		
21	ALSO PRESENT: GREG GHIOZZI, United	States Postal	Inspector
22	child different of the children	Jeaced Testal	mopededi
23			
24			
25			
	I		

CABBYOU1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(In open court)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Honorable Colleen McMahon presiding. This is 12 Cr. 36, United States of America v. Menachem Youlus.

Your appearance, please.

MS. FRIEDLANDER: Good afternoon, your Honor. Nicole Friedlander and Janis Echenberg for the government. With us today is Postal Inspector Greg Ghiozzi.

MS. ECHENBERG: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. BRAFMAN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Benjamin Brafman and Mark Baker and my associate, Jacob Kaplan, for Mr. Youlus, who is present and ready for sentencing. Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Everybody have a seat. This matter is on for sentencing under Docket No. 12 Criminal 36 01, United States of America v. Menachem Youlus.

Mr. Youlus, having been found quilty by plea to one count of mail fraud and one count of wire fraud, each of them Class C felonies, in violation of 18 United States Code, Sections 1341 and 1343, respectively. Each count carries a statutory maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment, three years of supervised release, a \$250,000 fine or twice the gross gain to the defendant or loss to identifiable victims other than the defendant, and a \$100 special assessment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In connection with today's proceedings, I have received and reviewed the presentence report prepared by United States Probation Officer Walter J. Flynn. I have an extraordinary number of other documents, all of which have been called to my attention, all of which I will put on the record.

I have sentencing memoranda from the government and from Mr. Brafman, as well as an additional letter from Mr. Brafman that is dated September 28, 2012, and addressed to me.

I have a pile of victim impact letters that have been submitted by Wendy Olsen Clancy, the victim witness coordinator, with the United States Attorney's Office. Some of them are from lawyers; some of them are from individuals who were defrauded. This is that pile.

I have from Mr. Brafman two extensive binders containing, I believe, a total of, Binder A, 79 letters; Binder B, additional letters, not separately numbered, but as you can see, it is an inch thick. In addition, I have several other-okay. Those are from Mr. Brafman.

Then I have things that are filed-- I have what is called Exhibit A. I'm not sure what this is Exhibit A to and Exhibit B to.

> Are these from the government's sentencing memorandum? MS. FRIEDLANDER: Yes, your Honor. They're exhibits

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sentencing

to our sentencing memorandum. 1

> THE COURT: Exhibits from the government's sentencing memorandum. Then there are Exhibits C, E, F, G and H to the government's sentencing memorandum which have been filed under seal.

Is there an Exhibit D to the government's sentencing memorandum? Because I can't find it.

MS. FRIEDLANDER: Yes. D should have been with A and Those were all-- A, B and D were the exhibits that we filed.

THE COURT: Jimmy, is there a D in that pile somewhere? Because I couldn't find D.

Okay. Then I have a consent order of forfeiture. I have an order of restitution, which is not something that I'm accustomed to seeing since I have pronounced restitution orally.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Here's Exhibit D. Oh, Exhibit D. Let me look at Exhibit D. Okay.

Those are the government's sentencing memorandum exhibits.

Then I have two letters dated October 10: One from the United States Attorney, which submits the proposed restitution order, and one from Mr. Brafman that addresses the proposed restitution order. That's what I've got piled up here on the bench.

CABBYOU1 Sentencing

1 Is there anything else I should have seen in writing prior to today's proceedings from the government? 2 3 MS. FRIEDLANDER: No, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: From the defendant? 5 MR. BRAFMAN: I don't believe so, your Honor, but may 6 I just ask for clarification? Your Honor held up a pile of 7 letters that your Honor classified as victim impact letters that were provided by the government, including letters from 8 9 people who were defrauded. Among the impact letters that we 10 received from the government, which we quote in our memo 11 extensively, are people who are classified as victim impact 12 letters--13 THE COURT: "I don't feel victimized in the same way 14 as other victims." I've got every -- this is just a pile of 15 letters I've gotten from the government. MR. BRAFMAN: That's fine, your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: All right? 18 MR. BRAFMAN: Yes. You have them all. 19 THE COURT: I have people on both sides of the aisles 20 I have victims who say I don't feel victimized, but I 21 have victims who want to kill the defendant. I've got 22 everybody -- and everybody in between, every shade of person in 23 between. 24 MR. BRAFMAN: Thank you very much, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Has the government reviewed the

25

presentence report?

MS. FRIEDLANDER: Yes, your Honor, we have.

THE COURT: Additions, deletions or corrections?

MS. FRIEDLANDER: No, we don't. We don't have any changes.

THE COURT: Ms. Friedlander, do you wish to be heard on sentencing?

MS. FRIEDLANDER: Yes, your Honor, I do.

THE COURT: I thought you might.

MS. FRIEDLANDER: Your Honor, the defense has given you a submission that talks at length about the defendant's many good deeds in the community and the pain that his family will feel if he goes to jail. I expect that we're going to hear some more about that today.

I just want to be clear, we don't have any doubt about either of those things and we do think the Court should take those into account. But we want to be clear that there are many other factors not addressed in their sentencing submission that weigh in favor of a guidelines sentence in this case.

In terms of the emotional impact of this crime,

Mr. Youlus has committed one of the most devastating frauds in
recent memory. He exploited people's need to remember loved
ones who suffered or died in the Holocaust. He manipulated his
own community's need to bear witness to a catastrophe among

CABBYOU1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

their people, and he did it all to enrich himself day in and day out for years.

On top of that, as the Court knows, this is not a case where the defendant was motivated by financial hardship or desperation. Mr. Youlus had every advantage: Education, citizenship, family support, secure employment, and financial stability. Things that many people can only dream about. was motivated by pure greed to get money from innocent people at the expense of their most sacred memories and beliefs.

The Court has received a number of powerful letters from victims and there are some victims who would like to be heard briefly today. There's one person who's written to the Court who I don't believe intends to speak today whose presence in the courtroom I'd just like to draw the Court's attention to. His name is Menachem Rosensaft.

Mr. Rosensaft's parents survived the concentration camps at Auschwitz and Bergen-Belsen. He himself was born in the Displaced Persons camp at Bergen-Belsen. Mr. Rosensaft is currently the vice president of the American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors and Their Descendants, which is the umbrella organization of Holocaust survivors and Their Descendants in the United States. He's also the general counsel of the World Jewish Congress, and he is a lecturer at Columbia Law School and Cornell Law School, among other places.

Sentencin

I'd just like to read briefly from his letter, which I think captures the significance of this crime to many members of the Jewish community who are not direct financial victims of this fraud.

He wrote: "The millions murdered by the Third Reich deserve a rigorously factual and scrupulously honest remembrance."

(Continued on next page)

MS. FRIEDLANDER: "So do the hundreds and thousands of Torah scrolls and other sacred Jewish writings and religious artifacts that were decimated in the Holocaust together it with thousands upon thousands of Jewish communities, Jewish homes, synagogues and Hasidic prayer rooms across Nazi-occupied Europe. Mr. Youlus is not the first to distort and falsify Holocaust memory, but he is without question one of the most reprehensible. Others have lied about their past to aggrandize themselves or further an antiSemitic ideology. Mr. Youlus's motivation was pure greed. He exploited the memory of the dead to enrich himself illicitly."

Your Honor, would I have an opportunity to respond after Mr. Brafman speaks?

THE COURT: The government always has an opportunity to respond.

MS. FRIEDLANDER: Okay. Well, with that then, your Honor, I'll rest on our submission. For the reasons that we discussed in our sentencing memorandum, we ask that you sentence the defendant to a guidelines sentence of 51 to 63 months.

THE COURT: It seems to me that it's appropriate now that we hear, since it's really part of the government's presentation, from any of the individuals who wish to speak today. I've been advised that there are three individuals who wish to speak.

Good afternoon, ma'am.

MS. EPSTEIN MAKAR: Good afternoon, your Honor. My name is Chaplain Mollie Epstein Makar, and I appreciate the court's indulgence for me to spend a couple of minutes just to give you my story of how this fraud affected us.

The basis of Jewish law and tradition is the Torah, and the Torah contains narrative statements of law and statements of ethics. Collectively, these laws, usually called Biblical Law or Commandment, are sometimes referred to as the Law of Moses or the Jewish Written Law. The Torah consists of five books of the Hebrew Bible, known more commonly as the Old Testament, and we believe that they were given by God to Moses on Mount Sinai and include within them all of the Biblical Laws of Judaism. The Torah is also known as the Pentateuch, or the Five Books of Moses.

And now the word mitzvah. A mitzvah is a commandment, one of the 613 relating to Jewish observance and religious practice. The commandments are the centerpiece of Judaism because they are where the faithfulness to God and his Torah translate into action.

Every sphere of human activity falls under the Torah's authority. From rising in the morning to retiring at night, from birth until death, the commandments encompass every area of Jewish life. This idea sets the scene for understanding how the Torah commandments come to define and explain what living

means for a Jew -- namely, the continual opportunities to connect to God.

And I would like to turn our attention to one of these 613 commandments found in the Torah, and this is the positive commandment for each and every Jewish man to write a Torah scroll for himself. The source for this is found in the book of Deuteronomy, chapter 31, verse 19, where it states, and I quote, "And now write down this song for yourself." The implication is that each person writes an entire Torah which contains the song referred to in that verse. In rabbinic literature, the highest ideal of all Jewish men is Torah study. Engaging in the study of Torah is considered equal to a number of the other mitzvahs — as we call them, mitzvots — such as visiting the sick, honoring one's parents, and bringing peace between people.

The reason I explain Torah and mitzvah is to enable the court to understand the level of importance and significance they hold in Jewish practice.

Now as I mentioned, a mitzvah is incumbent upon every Jew to write or facilitate in the writing of a Torah. Writing a Torah is not possible for the lay individual. It requires extensive training and takes a professional over a year to finish one scroll. For that reason, many people contribute funds to enable a Torah to be scribed. And I have an example here of a certificate from 1999 when my synagogue commissioned

the scribing of a new Torah. Members of the congregation and of the community at large contributed various sums of money that together paid for the Torah. The completion of a scroll is a cause for tremendous celebration. The completed Torah is paraded into the synagogue with great jubilation and fanfare, equivalent to the arriving of a bride for her wedding. Usually the procession carries on for blocks and for streets, with everyone celebrating the commission of this new Torah and bringing it and its holiness into our midst. You can see from this that my family contributed a sum of money to enable our congregation to finance that new Torah. And we dedicated our donation in honor of our parents' wedding anniversary and chose a verse from the Torah that speaks to the relationship between parents and children. In this way we all became partners in the mitzvah of writing this new Torah.

At the time of my father's 75th birthday, February 2008, we were looking to do something meaningful in his Honor, and my father comes from a long line of deeply religious, committed Jews. His father was a cantor, his father's brothers were cantors. A cantor is a member of the clergy who leads the liturgical portion of a prayer service, performs weddings, funerals, and the like. So we searched for some way to appropriately honor this milestone.

My sister found the Save a Torah website. I called the office in Baltimore and spoke with Ellen Elow-Mintz, who

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was the executive director at the time, and she explained the wonderful works that Save a Torah was doing, and she told me that she would send me a DVD showing actual rescues, refurbishings, and placing of Torahs around the world. really thought that this would be a more than wonderful way to honor my father's 75th birthday. What better way than contributing to the continuance of Torah Judaism through an organization that is actually hands on, taking damaged Torahs from the depths of despair, those rescued from places devastated during the Holocaust and other locations, and giving them new life in new communities. I was told that the Torahs were placed in communities that prior to that didn't have a Torah. How privileged, we felt, to be a part of the work to bring living Judaism into communities thirsting for the opportunity to pray and to live as the Torah directs them. This was also a beautiful way to fulfill the mitzvah of passing on Judaism from one generation to the next, that we call in Hebrew 1'dor vador.

So I collected money from the family, my sister, my children, and sent a donation in to Save a Torah. Ellen sent me a beautiful letter to present to my father. I have a copy of that here, if you're interested to see it, your Honor.

And we framed the letter and we presented it to dad. He read the letter out loud and the tears began to form in his eyes. By the time he finished reading the letter, the tears

were streaming down his face. He was so overcome with emotion, he had difficulty speaking. When dad was able to speak, he expressed his deep appreciation for performing this wonderful mitzvah in his name. He reminisced about his childhood and his synagogue and the prominence of the Torah, the life lessons he learned from the study of Torah. He elaborated about the importance of this work and how elated he was that these Torahs are being lovingly cared for and being placed for continued use. He placed the framed letter prominently on the mantel in the front room of his home, and that is where it stayed, till now.

Later that evening we all watched the DVD that Ellen had sent. It was so well done and so convincing that we all had tears in our eyes.

From that time dad would occasionally refer to the letter or show it to a visitor to the house and speak about the wonderful work being done in restoring Torahs by Save a Torah. That birthday gift was truly the best one we had ever given him, or so we thought.

Then I began receiving notices from the US Department of Justice Victims Notification System. I hadn't heard anything about this on the news and so these letters were a complete shock. I called the number, the phone number on the letter and spoke to Wendy Olsen Clancy, the victim witness coordinator, who explained the case to me, and I really

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

appreciated her ability to make it understandable and the respect she showed for the Torah and for Judaism in the way she spoke.

I was truly shaken after my conversation with Wendy. There were so many thoughts and emotions running through me, but the most devastating was, what do I do now? Do I keep this information to myself or do I tell my family? Especially, do I tell my father? This information tormented me for months. sister and I realized that we were both receiving these letters, and finally the letter came notifying us about this court date today. This gave me the impetus to act. I decided to tell my children. They were horrified, on many levels. idea that someone would use the Torah, the essence of our law and our lives, as a vehicle to commit a crime was beyond them -- beyond all of us, really. And it was embarrassing to us as a people to find that a member of our clergy, someone we entrust to teach us the Torah way of life, would use the Torah and the horrors of the Holocaust to prey -- that's P-R-E-Y -on fellow Jews and festivities and cause them harm. And we felt embarrassed and angry at having fallen victim to a scam.

We then decided to tell our father, and it was one of the most difficult things we had to do. The family was together, and we told him what we learned from the letters and the phone calls. The height of his elation that he showed at receiving the letter for his birthday paled in comparison to

the depths of sadness and upset he showed at receiving this news. He said the same thing we all said: How can this be? How can this happen? But in my father's own way, to try to lessen the burden on his children, as we all do with our children, he tried to make us feel better by telling us that our intentions were honorable, that we readily contributed to what we thought was a mitzvah in the making. The stain is not on us. It still didn't erase the mortifying feeling and the feeling of loss and victimization.

And your Honor, I spoke with my Rabbi about the appropriateness of speaking here today, because it's not comfortable to do this, for a fellow human being, for a fellow Jew. But I know I was conflicted. And he told me that although it is not for us to contribute to someone's misfortune, it is incumbent upon us to bear witness to an observed wrongdoing. And he said it would be important for me to tell our story, our family's story. So with a heavy heart, I stand before you today.

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. EPSTEIN: Hello.

THE COURT: Hello.

MS. EPSTEIN: I'm Rachel Epstein, and I'll just take -- I'll be very brief because my sister was so eloquent and so authentic in everything that she has already recounted

on behalf of our family.

I just think it needs to be said that — how this has got to be probably one of the saddest times to actually have to address this court, and with our own people. This is our own people. And with our history and what has happened to our people, to think that this is something that one is doing to another.

When I found Save a Torah, it was like our go-to thing, and interestingly enough, you could see through my checks, is there were several one right after another, saying we found a fabulous, wonderful way to honor people that are close to us, and so it became our thing. And to see something like this is just absolutely overwhelming. But to the point also where we have contributed several times on behalf of clergy, Christian clergy who are scholars who I deal with in my business life, who were so honored by this kind of thing, and the embarrassment in how you even begin to explain. Unlike Dad, who knew where I stand, I didn't even have the heart to say to Christian clergy that, "Never mind what we told you. That was really all of nothing."

So it does go a little bit beyond even our own community, and I just wanted to impart those words. And thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. KUSHNER: Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.

MR. KUSHNER: Thank you. My name is Robert Kushner.

THE COURT: Good. Thank you.

MR. KUSHNER: And it was in memory of my father that the Torah was acquired from Menachem Youlus from supposedly a grave in Kamyanets-Podilsky, which is the community in which my father grew up, was born, and in which his siblings lived.

Because of the love for my father and the love of other members of the family for my father, I decided that the best way to honor him would be to dedicate a Torah that came from Kamyanets-Podilsky in his memory and contribute it to our synagogue.

As was explained a little while ago, when a new Torah is brought into a synagogue, it's treated as the wedding. The Torah is carried under a canopy, and in this particular case, the Torah was carried by my 11-year-old grandson, who bears my father's English and Hebrew names.

In my opinion, this is not a garden variety type of fraud. It's not the kind of situation where somebody has been deprived of money. Here, memories or honors are really being trod upon. And there is tremendous disappointment and sadness when that happens. We — when the Torah was acquired, it was with great jubilation that my wife and I — at that point we'd been married for almost 50 years, and she knew my father well, and Menachem Youlus had referred us to a Rabbi Chinn, who was

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

an Orthodox rabbi in Pittsburgh to whom I spoke. Now Rabbi
Chinn subsequently passed away, and I didn't know whether
Menachem Youlus was aware of it, so we wrote a letter telling
him that. And within the letter we said, my wife and I,
"Rabbi, I cannot even begin to tell you what a blessing you've
bestowed upon us by permitting us to acquire the Torah." So
you can imagine we were flying this high, only to be crashed to
the ground.

What is -- and I will be brief, your Honor. I'm aware of the court's time. What is amazing to me is not only the overall story which was untrue, but how many different variants of the story there were. In the first instance, when we became aware of the fact that there was another Torah, related to a family by the name of Malinoff, who I believe lived in the Poconos in Pennsylvania. The story that they were told was that a tour stopped in Kamyanets-Podilsky and was told by a farmer that there were tombstones with Hebrew lettering on them. Among the members of the tour, according to what the Malinoffs have said, was an agent for Menachem Youlus. He then told Menachem Youlus what he was told by the farmer and, according to this article, supposedly Menachem Youlus then went to Kamyanets-Podilsky and dug up the Torah, and that story becomes history.

This -- the story of the Torah took on in essence a life of its own. It was -- articles were written clearly

across the country. One article appeared in Hadassah Magazine, which is a Jewish organization, distributed throughout the country. An article appeared in The Christian Science Monitor. And in that article, it says of Menachem Youlus, "Recounting his experiences with all the calm of reciting a grocery list, he says, 'I once spent the night in a Soviet prison, I was beaten up in Germany, and lost two front teeth. I was once knocked out.'" It then went on and said, "Two Torah scrolls lay nestled among 260 set of bones that belonged to Jewish children." Now this is what The Christian Science Monitor says that Menachem Youlus told them.

In another article which appeared I believe in a blog, it says, "The remnants of 260 men, women, and children were still shrouded in clothing that bore the Star of David, which Jews were forced to wear during the Holocaust. Discovered four years ago, the scrolls ——" and that's these two "—— were two of more than 400 Torahs that Youlus and a team of scribes have unearthed from a dark past. Youlus has spent the last 19 years scouring Eastern Europe for them, working with fellow scribes to restore the scrolls."

Now it's my understanding that Menachem Youlus never went overseas so that all of these stories are nothing but fabrication.

As the woman who spoke before me said, I too spoke with my Rabbi and asked him whether it was appropriate for me

to testify. This is a Jew testifying against another Jew. And he said to me, "Bob, Judaism is about justice. Therefore, you should testify." And that is what brought me from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania this morning to this courtroom. I thought in my father's memory, it was terribly important that I do so, and had he been alive, it is something he would have wanted me to do.

And I thank the court for its time.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Mr. Brafman, have you reviewed the presentence report and gone over it with your client?

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I will hear you on sentencing.

MR. BRAFMAN: Your Honor, before I begin, there are just two matters that I've told the government that we would mention just for purposes of clarification.

The letter dated July 12, 2012 to probation in which we listed certain objections is withdrawn, and the probation officer has noted in his report just certain biographical information that was changed, but to the extent that has not been changed, these objections are withdrawn.

Second, your Honor, I just want the record to reflect and for the court to understand that any argument that I advance either now or how we advanced it in written form, it was our intention to request a nonguidelines sentence pursuant

to a downward variance. We are not asking for any specific downward departure, and to the extent the sentencing memorandum labeled it as such, that was mistaken.

THE COURT: You know, I figured that that was what you meant.

MR. BRAFMAN: I gave the government a commitment that we would straighten that out.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BRAFMAN: Judge, I too spoke with my Rabbi, and I don't know whether that's a good thing or a bad thing. I have personally dreaded this day for many months, and it's nothing personal. I've had the privilege of appearing in this court from the first day, but this is, in 37 years, perhaps one of the three or four worst moments I think I've ever had to spend in the well of a courtroom — for reasons having to do with the case and for reasons having to do with me.

I listened to these victims, and there's nothing I can say. And there's nothing I will say. And I listened to them talk about the people whose memory is desecrated by what was done, and that includes my grandparents, who were murdered in Auschwitz. And I did save a Torah, and my father carried it from a burning synagogue on Kristallnacht that is now restored.

So when this case came to me, I did not want to be in this case. I spoke to a very prominent rabbi and said, "I'm not the right guy. I carry too much baggage." He said,

"You're the right guy. That baggage will help you be an even more powerful advocate perhaps in this case than someone who doesn't maybe get it and maybe doesn't understand the pain of everyone in this case."

So I stand before you today not as a son or a grandson; I stand before you with great respect as an advocate. But I stand here with great respect for the victims, with great respect for the pain that they have suffered, with great respect for the damage done in the name of Judaism, in the name of charity, and to the memory of those who perished in the Holocaust. We cannot ignore those facts. The sort of pain in this courtroom and in this case have weighed on my mind and Mr. Baker's mind for months and months.

But it's interesting that with respect to each of the victims who spoke eloquently, what I did not hear, and which I commend them for, I did not hear a cry for vengeance, I did not hear a request for the most severe punishment that the law allows, and I did not hear anything about the word "compassion" or lack of compassion. And that's what I'm going to talk about today, Judge. I can't deal with the facts. The facts are the facts. I think what we have essentially done is gotten to a point with the government where we have essentially conceded that this is a horrific crime and that once you have a horrific crime, then the question is, how do you go about doing the best you can, given the horrific facts you have, to at least make it

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

as right as humanly possible and to hopefully convince a sentencing court that you are not a worthless human being, that you have many redeeming qualities, and that's what our submissions I think have been about and that's what we are trying to do. That's what my letter was about. I speak to the court very respectfully, I hope, at all times, but very diligently as an advocate who really, I think, trusts the system and has grown up in this system and has worked on both sides of this aisle and understands the role of the US Attorney's Office. And these two ladies have conducted themselves throughout these proceedings with great respect and great diligence and professionalism, and I have nothing but praise for both of them. They have proven to be a credit to the United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York. So this isn't about them and it's not about me. It's about now, today, and what we do.

And I want to just say one thing so your Honor doesn't get me wrong. I know you've read everything, and I'm not going to repeat all of the arguments we made, nor am I going to quote from all of the letters. But I want to say this, because it's something I was taught by colleagues. When you are in the well of a courtroom, even if you know the judge has read everything and even if you understand that you may be repeating an argument you've already made, don't presume that the court has made up their mind until you are finished and until the last

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

word is spoken and do what you were supposed to do as an Be an advocate for your client. ethical advocate. And I do it for two reasons -- hopefully to convince your Honor that the power of our argument has merit, or at least some merit; and second, in fairness to Mr. Youlus, his young children are one day going to read the transcript of these proceedings that are available online almost instantaneously today, and they need to know that there are redeeming qualities to their father, they need to know that he is not all bad, and they need to know that despite the bad thing that he did that is indefensible, someone got up in a public courtroom and said, yes, this is a bad thing that was done by a fundamentally good man. And I can't explain it, and I'm not asking you to forgive him; I'm just asking you to temper justice with mercy when you decide on the appropriate punishment.

So let me just briefly, your Honor, suggest a few things. And I will indicate to your Honor, I gave strict instructions, which obviously were not followed, that I did not want people in the courtroom, that I don't think it was necessary, that the degree of embarrassment and humiliation did not have to be exacerbated. These people came. Many of them are victims. Many of them have asked to address the court, and I said no, we're not doing this. This is not a tennis match of victims. You're not — your claim that you are not considered a victim by yourself doesn't undo the damage done to the people

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

who feel victimized. It doesn't help. What does help -- and I think it's something which I think your Honor may consider -- is that people who were victimized nevertheless write to the court, some of them very eloquently, and ask for compassion. They don't forgive him, but they ask for compassion and leniency on his behalf.

Your Honor, the real question before you today is how much punishment is adequate and what form that punishment should take. So to the extent that the government has claimed that there is \$963,000 that is owed to the victims -- \$993,000that's owed to the victims, we are going to pay that money back and we are -- most of it is already in an escrow account awaiting instruction as to how to pay that back. And we offered, your Honor, at the time of the plea comment, which I think was appropriate, quite frankly, that your Honor believed that forfeiture should go to the victims rather than sit in some government bank account. We will obviously follow the court's direction. So to the extent that this defendant unjustly enriched himself, can't do more than give the money back, and whether he's giving it back because he wants you to note that fact or because the government forces him to give it back, the fact is that it's a consideration that the court may consider.

Your Honor, the letters before your Honor, yes, there are several hundred, and in the second volume -- we're sorry we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

did not index them, but in the second volume, there is an index in the front that does number the letters, and the numbers of the letters, the total is more than 200 letters. And the letters are interesting, and I know that some letters mean more than others when a sentencing court reads them and maybe some letters, after you've been on the bench for a long time, you just sort of -- "I get it. He's a good man. He did a nice thing." But I want to read to you not from a letter. I want to cite to you one of the cases -- we cite this our sentencing memorandum, which is the Serafini case in the Third Circuit. And what's interesting about the Serafini case is, that was a guidelines case. It was in 2000, before Booker and all of the progeny that essentially gives you more discretion, and that was a case where the defendant in Serafini did three nice things. Three. He did three things, went out of his way to help three citizens, and the Serafini court made a big deal about it. They said when you give money to charity, that's okay, and it's something we would consider, but when you go out of your way to help a fellow citizen, do something that takes your time, takes your effort, that is extra credit. important; maybe more important than simply being a charitable person.

You have hundreds of letters in which the kindness of Menachem Youlus to fellow citizens is discussed in detail, and whether it's helping an elderly person or helping a sick child

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

or a child with special needs, there is letter after letter after letter that writes honestly and eloquently about good things he did. Not writing a check, not giving ill-gotten gains to a charity. I once heard a judge in this building say, "I'm not impressed with somebody who steals a million dollars and gives a hundred thousand to a charity. It doesn't move me." But going out of your way to help hundreds of people long before he ever thought that he would have to stand in the well of a court and ask for compassion at the time of sentencing, which is -- again, this is not niceness after you have a criminal case so that a judge will look kindly upon you. is 25 years of being a good, decent person in which he has helped people. How do you reconcile the two people, the nice man who helps everyone, with the man who -- I can't. Maybe there's a higher authority that will one day explain that to me, but I can't, Judge. I can't reconcile it. And Menachem Youlus recognizes that he has sinned not just by violating the law, but in the statement that he wrote, which he will read in a minute, he talks about standing before God and having to at one point ask forgiveness from God. I am going to hope I am not his advocate at that point. Asking the compassion from a sentencing judge for this crime is I think different than asking for forgiveness. That's a hard ask for forgiveness. It's hard enough asking for compassion, but forgiveness for people who were defrauded, I don't know if they're ever going

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to forgive him. Maybe by asking you to not severely punish him, that brings out the best in maybe all of us and that even in this moment when they are so angry, they don't — they don't ask you to do something which is solely within your discretion.

And then I want to read very quickly a quote that I know your Honor is familiar with, and it's from a judge in this building that all of us I think have great respect for. quote from United States v. Adelson, where Judge Rakoff said something, which again, in that case, it was a pretty serious crime. The quidelines were 20 years. Judge Rakoff imposed a five-year sentence, I believe, because there were a hundred people who wrote letters on behalf of the defendant in that case. And Judge Rakoff said, in words that I wish I could have written, to be candid, "Surely, if ever a man is to receive credit for the good he has done and his immediate misconduct assessed in the context of his overall life hereto, it should be at the moment on his sentencing, when his very future hangs in the balance. This elementary principle of weighing the good with the bad, which is basic to all great religions, moral philosophies, and systems of justice, was plainly part of what Congress had in mind when it directed courts to consider as a necessary sentencing factor the history and characteristics of the defendant."

Judge, that's what I'm asking you to do under 3553.

You have before you a wide discretion that you didn't have when

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the guidelines were mandatory, and within the discretion that you have is the right to impose a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary. You never had that discretion when the guidelines were mandatory. In truth, many judges, I've heard in the wells of courtrooms throughout the country, have often said, "I wish I could do a different sentence but I'm mandated to impose this sentence."

Your Honor, I am asking for a sentence sufficient but not greater than necessary. And now I guess the question is, what does that mean, and how much is that? And that's I think the point that I want to address hopefully last. The numbers that are provided by the Sentencing Commission, with all respect, in many, many areas were somewhat arbitrary, and subsequent to the Booker decision, the courts have allowed a judge to conclude that those numbers are no longer even presumptively reasonable and that the court must start with an analysis but then should look to the defendant and the crime that the person has been accused of committing and then impose a sentence which I have said, which is sufficient but not greater than necessary. And what the Supreme Court has said only recently, the punishment should fit the offender and not merely the crime. And I'm citing from Pepper v. United States, quoting Williams v. New York. And your Honor, when you try and craft a sentence that punishes the offender in this case and not just the crime, I think it allows you to impose a sentence

that does not require a guidelines sentence, because the crime in this case is very serious. There's no dispute. But when you look at the other characteristics of 3553, there is no concern that this offender will act in a violent manner or hurt anyone in a violent manner. There is no concern that he will reoffend. That I think is uniquely unique to this case, if you will, because this case is just so strange and so different. He will never again be in a position to commit this crime. He's not required to have the removal from society, if you will, that might be appropriate in a case where you are concerned about a defendant being a repeat offender or a repeat danger to the community.

So then the question is, what's an appropriate form of punishment, and what factors and considerations must your Honor address or should your Honor consider? And in every government memo that I've ever seen at sentencing — and I don't say that in a pejorative way — when it comes to the family circumstances, there is a short line, and the line basically is that the defendant's family has no one to blame other than the defendant for bringing that horror on them and the defendant should have thought of this before. But we're beyond that step. And you know, I know from something you've written that there are — there are these op—ed pieces that you write and you don't file and you throw them in the trash. I've been doing it for 30 years, Judge. I call it dictated but not

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And you know, we sometimes do that at the spur of the But the one I'm writing, which I've been writing for ten years, is, my adversary is always 30. As old as I get in this business, my assistant United States attorney adversaries are generally people who are substantially younger than I am. And I don't say that in a bad way, because they're very talented and capable people, but what they don't get, what I didn't get, what I don't think anybody gets when you don't have children, when you don't have a family that's been gone on for 25 or 30 years, as the defendant has -- he's got nine kids, and he has a wife who is not well, and he has elderly parents who are not well. And yes, he should have thought of that at the time he committed these crimes. And it's clear from the manner in which he committed these crimes that he didn't think about the consequences at the time he committed these crimes or he wouldn't have committed these crimes, because there's no one to suggest that he is stupid. All of the money, all of the money that was -- that was taken appears to have been squirreled away. It's all sitting in some -- there's no trappings of wealth, your Honor. There are no cars or fancy homes. probation report values his home at \$250,000. He lives there with nine kids. I don't know what motivated him. I don't know what created this fantasy life that he lived and to the damage But the question is now: that he has done. What do we do? And do we warehouse him for 51 months because that sounds like

a good number? Is that a better number than 18 months or 24 months or home confinement and community service that he is so ideally situated for? I think the number is arbitrary, and I don't think your Honor should go to that number simply because it's been requested or recommended.

I think your Honor should and I hope you have taken into account everything I submitted. I know you have. I appreciate the patience, because I know I repeated in the well of the courtroom many of the arguments that I have made in writing, and I don't know what else I can say. And I ask your Honor, if there are specific questions that you want me to address, I will do my best to address them. But thank you for listening.

THE COURT: Actually, the one question I was going to ask you, you've answered, which is: Where's the money? Now I know. Thank you.

MR. BRAFMAN: It's all in the government's submission. And a million of it is almost in my escrow account that they're going to get the minute you sign the forfeiture order. And that's what we're talking about. There are Torahs. There are many, many Torahs that were bought. Maybe the invoices were inflated, but they were certified as kosher and independently examined as being real Torahs. So these people have Torahs. There are kosher Torahs. Now the fact that the provenance was not what it was and there were fantasy stories, I get it.

That's why we're here. That's the crime. But it isn't, "I took a million dollars and I went to Vegas or I bought a Mercedes." That didn't happen in this case, which is very often the case when a crime is motivated by greed, as the government suggests.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Brafman.

MR. BRAFMAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Friedlander.

MS. FRIEDLANDER: Your Honor, just briefly, as I said, we don't doubt that Mr. Youlus has committed good works, has done many good deeds in his community. We don't think those good deeds come close to outweighing all of the 3553(a) factors that show that a guidelines sentence is completely appropriate in this case. This crime was egregious. It was sustained. He relied on his status as a clergy member to commit it.

And for all of those reasons and the other reasons we set forth in our memo, this case is entirely appropriate to sentence him to the guidelines range contained in his plea agreement.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Youlus, I've read your letter. Do you have anything you want to say to me?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

Your Honor, I know that there is nothing that I can say that will excuse my conduct. I know that I have sinned

before God and also violated the laws of a wonderful country that has been good to me and my family. I will carry that shame and dishonor with me for the rest of my life.

I want to thank my lawyers for guiding me and helping me to live through this nightmare. I want to thank my family for still loving me despite the sadness and shame I have brought upon them. I will spend the rest of my life trying to find the appropriate way to apologize for the agony they now have to live with. They are very good people, and I have let them down terribly.

I don't know whether I merit compassion, but I have prayed and still pray that you find it in your heart to punish me compassionately and hopefully not separate me from my family.

I know that I have a lifetime of atonement ahead of me. I will spend the rest of my days on this earth trying very hard to do good, even though I know that I will never be able to restore my good name.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Have a seat.

The first thing I feel it necessary to do is to place on the record of this proceeding a summary of why we're here.

Mr. Youlus was in the family business -- Jewish Bookstore of Greater Washington, a store that sells Jewish books and Judaica. And as I understand it, he was a scribe,

one who knew the intricate art, the craft, ancient and honorable, of creating and restoring Torah scrolls. I can't describe for the record nearly as eloquently as Chaplain Epstein did the importance, the meaning, the sacredness of the Torah, to the Jewish community, to my own Christian community, to the community of Islam, the third great Abrahamic religion. The Books of Moses are foundation to us all.

Mr. Youlus founded a charity and solicited donations in support of the stated mission of rescuing Torahs, locating and acquiring Torahs that had survived the Holocaust or been taken from persecuted Jewish communities, and to inspect, repair, and restore these Torahs so that they could be used in worship. A noble goal, a goal that was calculated, calculated to play on the emotions of a people for whom the persecutions of the early and middle part of the last century were a living memory, many of whom were personally witnesses or who, through their family, or what remained of their families, were witnesses to the horrors of what happened in Nazi Germany, in Eastern Europe, in Soviet Russia, and elsewhere in the world.

But we're not here because Mr. Youlus was not really about the business of rescuing Torahs that had been lost to persecution. That, in the end, is a religious matter. We are here because Mr. Youlus is a liar and because he lied in order to obtain money and because he utilized the beneficence of his fellow citizens in the form of the tax code of the United

Cablyou2

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

States to structure his little enterprise so that he could obtain money under false pretenses, for his own purposes. I don't know what his purposes were. They weren't the usual purposes. Mr. Brafman is correct. There's no condo in Miami, there's no Mercedes, there are no exotic vacations. It's not another purpose that I have confronted frequently in cases of this ilk, which is taking money from this person so that it can be used by the charitable light of the thief.

Fortunately Mr. Brafman did not stand up, because he didn't have to stand up, he couldn't stand up and say that Mr. Youlus had used the money he obtained under false pretenses to give it to the poor or to build a synagogue in his own community or to do anything like that, because if he said that, then I would have said, well, you wouldn't say in those circumstances, would you, that nobody has the right to take other people's money and use it for what is charitable by their own light. But that's not the case. As near as I can tell, the reason is that Mr. Youlus has a screw loose, that Mr. Youlus has this desire to be something he's not, which is an adventurer, a hero. In the end that does not matter because the reason for stealing does not matter. A misrepresenter's reason for lying does not matter. It does not matter. What matters is the lie and the obtaining of money under false pretenses, pretenses to religious people, and we have heard eloquently today, I have read, eloquently expressed, dozens

Cablyou2

upon dozens of letters from people whose religious sensibilities were not just offended but trampled on by the misrepresentations that were made. The misrepresentations were to the entire American people, because Mr. Youlus and Save the Torah claimed that Mr. Youlus wasn't earning any profit or compensation from his work with the charity, which allowed Save the Torah to obtain federal tax exempt status to which it was not entitled, because it did not comply with the statute's requirement that no founders or members of the board of directors of the charity receive any profit from their position with the group.

I believe the government estimated Mr. Youlus ended up with about \$1.2 million. The fact that it's sitting in a bank account and available to repay the people who would not have given it to him if only they had known the truth doesn't mean he didn't get it, or that he didn't get it by false pretenses.

It's a strange story. It's a sad story. It's an incomprehensible story.

Now I'm sitting here, having listened to various people. Mr. Brafman says that he's heartened no one who spoke -- and certainly there's not much in the letters -- asked for vengeance or sought retribution. But that is not the rule of law, to exact vengeance.

Mr. Brafman also very eloquently said that forgiveness would be a hard ask. That is undoubtedly true, but as I have

Cablyou2

told defendants over and over and over again, I'm not about forgiveness. That is between Mr. Youlus and his maker. That is between Mr. Youlus and the people he has hurt. The law is about doing justice; doing justice to the perpetrator and giving justice to the victims. The law in its own way is what Chaplain Epstein's rabbi told her her statement would be about. The law is about bearing witness, bearing witness to what we as a society have agreed collectively are the rules of the game in which we are all commonly engaged. Justice and witness are satisfied by meting out a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to carry out the goals of the sentencing statute that has been crafted by the Congress of the United States.

(Continued on next page)

THE COURT: In deciding what is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, I am to consider a group of people who make it their business to think about these things, who have gotten together and have come up with a guideline for what, roughly, somebody who commits a crime like this one and who's like Mr. Youlus, sort of, was to get by way of punishment. That guideline would be 51 to 63 months in a federal penitentiary. Thankfully, I am no longer shackled by that. It is no longer a mandate, but it is something that I am required to take into account.

Then I have to take into account the nature and circumstances of the crime. And I can't quarrel with Ms. Friedlander's characterization of the nature and circumstances of the crime. For a member of the clergy to prey on the religious sensibilities of his co-religions is, frankly, a crime that turns my stomach in a way that few others do. You are not the first rabbi, you are not the first man of the cloth who has sat in front of me in these circumstances, and it doesn't get any easier for me to think about these stories because I've heard them before.

For those of you who express embarrassment because it was one of your own community, one of your own members of the clergy who had done this, and who wonder how you would explain this to those of other faiths, please, you are not alone and we all understand and appreciate and share your grief that this

thing could have happened.

I have received letters from religious congregations, from youth organizations, charitable organizations, kids, young people donating their bar mitzvah money to this organization, from groups of Holocaust survivors and their descendants, from people who are comfortable, from people who are struggling financially but for whom making this particular gesture was of critical psychological and emotional importance.

And, Mr. Youlus manipulated those people and he preyed on those people. And whatever the reason for it, there is no excuse. It was brazen, it was horrible, and took a while for it to be exposed. I certainly have read Mr. Rosensaft's letter. Mr. Rosensaft appears to be the Harry Markopolos of the story. He's the guy who got it first.

So the government's characterization of the nature and circumstances of the offense is not something that would cause me to vary from the guidelines. It might even cause me to go above the guidelines. Certainly does not move me to vary from the guidelines.

The history and characteristics of the defendant, something else I must take into account. Mr. Youlus is described by all of these people in these two books, whose letters I have read, as being a person who does good things for others. He helps with marriages, he prepares scrolls, he makes kosher things that need to be kosherized. He's there with

advice.

The reason I was hoping someone would tell me what happened to the money is usually these letters are all about how he helps people, he gives me money. There's none of that in there. Okay. So to the people he knows, he's a nice guy. To the people he doesn't know, he didn't care. I believe that in the Torah every Jew, and therefore every Christian, every Muslim, is required to do good to the widow, to the orphan and the alien in your midst. And I understand that to mean you ought to be to strangers as you are to the people that you encounter in your own community.

People who have written to me, in the other pile of letters, people of whom Ms. Friedlander speaks, people who spoke here today, they're strangers to you and you did not care for them. And the fact that you are a rabbi, trained and immersed in your religious tradition, it just makes it that much worse. Because I must believe that one who is trained in a religious tradition that like none other is founded on the law knows that it is never right to take under false pretenses, to pretend to be someone that you're not.

So neither the nature nor the circumstances of the crime or the history and characteristics of the defendant suggest that I should be particularly lenient here. I must say, I feel the same way about the fact that you're going to pay back the money that is sitting there waiting to be given

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

back to the people to whom it rightfully belongs. Whether you're doing it because-- I hope you're not doing it to impress me because it doesn't impress me. It's just something you have It's not extraordinary. You pay them back twice over, three times over, ten times over, maybe that's extraordinary. To give them back what they gave to you, that's not so extraordinary.

So then we come to the next section of the sentencing law. I'm supposed to think about what kind of a sentence would punish you because, in the end, as I once said in print, you know, I'm about retribute of justice. That's what I'm supposed I'm supposed to decide what the punishment is. And I'm supposed to think about what will send a message to other people who might be tempted to do the kind of thing that you did. I have to think about proportionality, although, frankly, it's very hard for me to acquaint this to anything that I've ever encountered.

And I must tell you, I think you must go to jail, and I think the guidelines get it about right. And I happen to think that is a compassionate sentence, because if there were no guideline suggested to me, I might well be tempted to give you a whole lot more time. Will your family suffer? Of course your family will suffer, and that is a terrible tragedy. have brought it on them yourself.

I hope and expect -- indeed, I will require -- that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

when you leave prison, you will live a righteous and honorable life. If you don't, I will have to put you back in. prospect does not move me to excuse you prison because that would not be justice.

Finally, to those of you who have spoken so eloquently and so movingly, I know the importance of Torah to your communities and I grieve for the pain that you feel because your gesture of honor on behalf of loved ones has been -- or so it may seem -- thrown back in your face.

I love those five books. They're probably, just in terms of literary merit, among the five best books ever written; certainly among the most interesting. And I have to believe that what they contain can somehow be divorced from what has happened here and that the words on the scrolls that do exist can be given life through your families, through your congregations.

And that, ultimately, their meaning and the fact that they still retain that meaning in spite of all this can be found in the words of the prophet Jeremiah in a book that is not Torah, but is Tanak. He said, "I will write the law in their hearts." You could not speak the way you spoke today if the law were not written in your hearts. This man cannot take that away from you or from your loved ones or from your memories or from your history. Hold to that.

I have reviewed the presentence report. I accept it

CABBYOU3

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and adopt as my findings the description of the offense and the offense conduct, its calculation in the guidelines. The total offense level, based primarily on the amount of the financial loss, is 24. The criminal history category of the defendant is I. And I should note, it is Criminal History Category I because the defendant has never before been convicted of a crime, but that does not make this conduct aberrational. is conduct that went on over a period of about seven years, day in and day out, and that's not aberrational.

I accept and adopt as my findings the offender characteristics that are set out beginning at paragraph 83 of the presentence report. I believe, Mr. Brafman, that the probation officer made the changes that were not otherwise withdrawn in the most recent version of the presentence report that I got on September 27.

MR. BRAFMAN: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So I don't have to make any corrections to this document.

MR. BRAFMAN: That's correct.

THE COURT: Sir, will you please stand. Under Docket No. 12 Criminal 36-01, a total offense level of 24, Criminal History Category of I, I hereby sentence you, Menachem Youlus, to be remanded to the custody of the Attorney General of the United States and the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 51 months to be followed by a term of three years' supervised release.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The terms of imprisonment and supervised release are concurrent on both counts.

The other financial penalties are such that I am not imposing a fine other than there is a special assessment of \$200 in the nature of court costs which is due and payable immediately.

Before we get into the financial stuff, Mr. Brafman, are there recommendations that you would like me to make concerning this?

MR. BRAFMAN: Yes, your Honor. First, with consent of the government and subject to your Honor's approval, we would ask that the defendant be permitted to voluntarily surrender. I've spoken to a representative of the Bureau of Prisons concerning the amount of time needed for designation. We ask for a surrender date of December 17th. Because of the intervening holidays, it takes a little bit longer. If there is a designation to the recommended facility or elsewhere prior to that date, we can always advance the surrender date.

THE COURT: December 17th is fine with me.

MR. BRAFMAN: Thank you, your Honor. And we would ask for a recommendation for religious and dietary reasons that the defendant be permitted to serve his sentence in the Otisville federal prison camp in Otisville, New York.

THE COURT: Otisville is--

MR. BRAFMAN: I know it's a recommendation.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Otisville appears to be, as far as I know, about the only place in the northeastern United States that may be able to accommodate the defendant. By the same token, Otisville is very full.

MR. BRAFMAN: I know, but we --

THE COURT: I will certainly make the recommendation, but no quarantees.

MR. BRAFMAN: I understand it's only a recommendation, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: But I'm making it Otisville. I'm not making it the camp. I'm saying Otisville. All right?

MR. BRAFMAN: Your Honor, to the extent that the defendant is deemed camp eligible, I'm not hearing that your Honor objects to that.

THE COURT: No, but that's for the BOP.

MR. BRAFMAN: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: All I'm saying is that I know that Otisville has the ability to accommodate the religious restrictions.

Okay. Now, sir, we have mandatory restitution in this case, and I have been given an order by the government under these new procedures that seem to be followed this days. order indicates that restitution will be paid in the amount of \$990,366.05, and that amount is ordered paid as restitution under the Mandatory Victims Restitution Act to the victims of

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ABBIUUS	Sentencing

1 the offenses charged in Counts One and Two, those victims being listed on Schedule A. 2 3 Yes, Ms. Friedlander, you quickly want to jump up? 4 MS. FRIEDLANDER: Yes, actually, I do. We are going 5 to submit a slightly revised Schedule A to the Court in the 6 morning. The Schedule that we have submitted has a couple of 7 just typographical errors. It does not change the amount of 8 restitution owed or any material. 9 THE COURT: Mr. Brafman, is it all right with you--10 MR. BRAFMAN: No objection. 11 THE COURT: -- if you look it over tomorrow and make 12 sure that it's all right? 13 MR. BRAFMAN: Yes, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: On this 11th day-- it is the 11th, isn't 15 it?

MR. BRAFMAN: 11th.

THE COURT: Thank you.

-- day of October, 2012, restitution is ordered in that amount. And consistent with the Mandatory Victims

Restitution Act and Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 49.1, the schedule of victims is going to be filed under seal except that copies may be retained, used or disclosed by the government, the clerk's office, and the probation office in order to effect the purposes of this order.

There is, in addition here, a consent order of

forfeiture. I said at the time of the plea that I did not understand, and I still do not understand, the idea of having both restitution and forfeiture when it's the same money. As far as I'm concerned, restitution comes first.

MR. BRAFMAN: Well, then, as I understand it then, the amount that will be forfeited will be credited against the restitution? That's the understanding we have with the government, I believe.

THE COURT: If that's the understanding that you have with the government, that's fine. If I ever hear that that money is sitting in a federal bank account somewhere and has not been distributed to the victims, I will be mightily upset.

MS. FRIEDLANDER: Yes. Your Honor, we had spoken with the chief about the forfeiture of our office and we are going to apply under the department--

THE COURT: I was hoping you would have applied before today and gotten permission so I would be secure in the knowledge that the victims would have gotten their money back.

That's all I care about.

MS. FRIEDLANDER: Yes, we understand. Your Honor, we are permitted to apply by the Department of Justice upon the entry of the forfeiture order, so we will apply immediately.

THE COURT: Oh, yes, the Department of Justice.

Always looking out for itself. Okay.

Well, it is hereby ordered that as a result of the

CABBYOU3

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

offenses charged in Counts One and Two of the information to which you have pled guilty, a money judgment in the amount of \$862,044.33 in United States currency shall be entered against you pursuant to Rule 32.2(b)(4) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. This consent order of forfeiture is final. as to the defendant, Menachem Youlus, as I read this order, it is deemed part of your sentence, Mr. Youlus, and will be included in your judgment of conviction.

Upon execution of this order of forfeiture and pursuant to 21, United States Code, Section 853, the United States Treasury Department shall be authorized to deposit the payments on the money judgment in the Treasury Asset Forfeiture Fund and the United States shall have clear title to such forfeited property even though it really belongs to the victims.

Pursuant to Rule 32.2(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, upon the entry of this order, the United States Attorney's Office is authorized to conduct any discovery that's needed to identify, locate or dispose of forfeitable property, including taking depositions, propounding interrogatories, requesting the production of documents, and issuing subpoenas pursuant to Rule 45 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

All payments on the outstanding money judgment shall be made by postal money order, bank or certified check made

CABBYOU3

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

payable in this instance to the United States Treasury Department and delivered by mail to the United States Attorney's Office, Southern District of New York, Attention: Asset Forfeiture Unit, One St. Andrew's Plaza, New York, New York, 10007, indicating Mr. Youlus's name and the case number.

This Court shall retain jurisdiction to enforce this order and to amend it as necessary pursuant to rule 32.2(e) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. I have signed the order today, the 11th of October, at 5:53 p.m. And it is my expectation that that money will be given to the victims.

Now, Mr. Youlus, when you get out of prison, you will be on supervised release. Within 72 hours of your release, you will report to a United States probation officer in this district either here in Manhattan -- by that time I hope the probation office will be back in this building -- or in White Plains or in Middletown. You will be assigned a probation officer and you will report to that probation officer on a regular basis for three years. You will do everything the probation officer tells you to do. You may do nothing that the probation officer tells you not to do. You may not commit another federal, state or local crime. You may not illegally possess any controlled substance. You may not possess any firearm or destructive device. The mandatory drug testing condition is suspended. The defendant poses a low risk of future substance abuse.

You must cooperate in the collection of genetic material, DNA, for inclusion in the criminal database. You must obtain and maintain legitimate and verifiable employment, which employment as a special condition cannot involve other people's money. You cannot for that three-year period do any kind of work that makes you responsible for other people's money.

You may not associate with criminals. You may not be found in places where criminal activity is being planned or carried out. Your probation officer must at all times know what your residence and work addresses are. You may not change those addresses without giving ten days' advanced notice to the probation department. And if there's an emergency, if there's a gas leak in the house and you have to leave, within 48 hours your probation officer must know where you can be found.

As special conditions of supervision, you must provide your probation officer with access to any requested financial information, and you shall not incur any new credit charges or open any additional lines of credit without approval of your probation officer unless you have paid the restitution. It has been represented to me that the entirety of the restitution is going to be paid forthwith. It is, therefore, not necessary to set a payment schedule. The payment schedule is pay it within the next 60 days.

MR. BRAFMAN: Can I get some guidance from your Honor

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in a moment, Judge?

THE COURT: Any time you want, Mr. Brafman.

MR. BRAFMAN: Thank you. Judge, we have an understanding with the government -- and I know the mechanics are a little bit tortured and it's nothing that you can control. It was our understanding -- obviously based in part on your Honor's comments at the time of this plea -- that the Court wants the money to go to the victims and that there isn't two piles of money available, so that this pile is going to hopefully be transferred by asset forfeiture to the government.

We will have all of the money within the 60 days that your Honor-- we have most of it now. My concern is that once T --

THE COURT: Here's what you should do, Mr. Brafman. I'll give you guidance as to what you should do. You give the government its \$862,000. You write a check to the United States Marshal and you give the government that money and you give the rest of the money to the clerk of the Court. And then, as far as I'm concerned, it's quits and you have no further obligation to give financial information to the probation officer.

MR. BRAFMAN: That's fair.

THE COURT: That is my understanding.

MR. BRAFMAN: And my hope is that eventually that the

balance of the money will go to the victims.

THE COURT: It better.

MR. BRAFMAN: Okay. I will do what your Honor suggests.

THE COURT: Thank you.

As a special condition of supervision, Mr. Youlus, you shall perform 100 hours of community service as directed by your probation officer. And it is my recommendation to the probation officer that the community service be directed to persons outside of the defendant's community, because one of the things that makes this crime a terrible crime is that the defendant, who was very good to the people he knows, was very not good to people he didn't know. So he should do good works for people he doesn't know.

As I said, you're to report to the nearest probation office within 72 hours of your release from custody. It is my recommendation that you be supervised by your district of residence.

And I don't anticipate that there will be any restitution still owing by the time you get into prison. If there still is restitution owing, then, if you're engaged in the Bureau of Prisons' non-UNICOR work program, you'll pay \$25 per calendar quarter toward your criminal financial penalties, or 50 percent of your gross monthly earnings if you're a UNICOR Grade I through IV employee. But that only applies -- I don't

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

want to make Mr. O'Neill's life miserable because he has to write this -- but that only applies if the restitution hasn't been paid by the time you report to prison.

I'm allowing you to surrender voluntarily on the 17th of December. Mr. Brafman will be notified about your designation to an institution. You have to report to that institution before 2 p.m. If you're not there by 2 p.m., we'll get a phone call at about 2:01; by 2:02 I will sign the warrant for your arrest. So forewarned is forearmed.

The other thing that I have to say to you is I'm really not expecting to see you again, Mr. Youlus, but if you should transgress any of the terms and conditions of your supervision -- the probation officers in this district understand how I feel about it. I'm a zero tolerance Judge. So if you should transgress, they'll bring you in front of me. If I see you during that three-year period, I'll be extremely upset. And when I get upset, I have a tendency to do things that defendants don't particularly like, like put them back in jail.

I just think it's only fair to warn you that that's my predilection. I would, of course, listen to Mr. Brafman's explanation for why you were there, but I start with a bias. The bias is that during that three-year period, you can do nothing wrong. Forewarned is forearmed. All right?

Mr. Brafman, is there anything else that we need to do

1	from your perspective today?
2	MR. BRAFMAN: No, your Honor.
3	THE COURT: I thank you, Mr. Brafman. I actually
4	MR. BRAFMAN: Your Honor, I'm sorry.
5	THE COURT: I can actually imagine how painful this
6	has been.
7	MR. BRAFMAN: Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Yes.
9	MR. BRAFMAN: I'm sorry, I stepped on your Honor's
10	words, but I thank you for what you were saying.
11	Your Honor, the government has asked me to place on
12	the record in spot of this plea agreement, Mr. Youlus has
13	waived his right to appeal to the extent there was a sentence
14	of 51 months or within the guidelines.
15	THE COURT: I think 63 months or less. Is that
16	correct?
17	MR. BRAFMAN: Correct.
18	THE COURT: I knew I forgot something. Thank you.
19	Ms. Friedlander. She's ready. She's ready to get up.
20	Okay.
21	Do you recall, Mr. Youlus, that at the time you took
22	your plea, you and I had a conversation about your appellate
23	rights?
24	THE DEFENDANT: I remember that.
25	THE COURT: And do you recall that I told you that you

CABBYOU3 Sentencing

1 had signed a letter with the government which provided that, if 2 I sentenced you to 63 months or less, you would not take an 3 appeal from your sentence? Do you remember that? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: And do you recall that I asked you at that 5 6 time, were you signing the letter of your own free will? 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 8 THE COURT: And you told me that you were. Do you 9 recall that? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Do you adhere to that statement today? 11 12 THE DEFENDANT: I do, yes. 13 THE COURT: In that case, it's my understanding that you have waived your right to take an appeal from your 14 sentence. 15 16 Is that also your understanding? 17 MR. BRAFMAN: Yes, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Thank you very much. 19 Ms. Friedlander, is there anything else we need to 20 talk about? 21 MS. FRIEDLANDER: No. Thank you, Judge. 22 THE COURT: One of the victims, Mr. Epstein, mentioned 23 Ms. Clancy, but Ms. Clancy doesn't get a whole lot of public 24 credit for the work that she does, but she makes it very easy

on us judges. And I want to thank you for having organized

25

```
CABBYOU3
                                  Sentencing
      this so well. Thank you very much.
 1
 2
                Okay. These proceedings are closed.
 3
                (Adjourned)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```